

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The House of Representatives Declined to Listen to the Reading of It.

DISCUSSED NAVAL PROGRAM.

Burton of Ohio Opposed it as a Departure From Policies That Have Been Country's Bulwark.

Washington, Feb. 22.—The anniversary of the birth of Washington was observed by the chaplain of the house when that body opened today. Mr. Williams, the minority leader, in accordance with the notice he gave Saturday, moved that the clerk read the farewell address of Washington, and that immediately thereafter the house adjourn.

A point of order made by Mr. Payne was sustained on the ground that the motion embraced two propositions.

Mr. Williams then moved that the house adjourn and pending that the unanimous consent be given for the reading of Washington's farewell address, having coupled a request with his motion. Mr. Williams' motion again was held not to be in order, when he asked unanimous consent that this being Washington's birthday, the farewell address be read. Upon the demand of Mr. Payne for the regular order, Mr. Williams moved to adjourn.

On roll call the motion was lost, 93 to 88. Three Republicans, McCrea, Patterson and Sibley, of Pennsylvania, voted with the minority for the motion. Otherwise there was a party alignment with the Republicans opposing adjournment.

The house then went into committee of the whole and resumed consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. Rixey of Virginia, a member of the naval affairs committee, said he was surprised that the secretary of the navy, in a recent address, should treat the support of the navy in a partisan way. He added that the secretary had reported to have said at a recent banquet in New York that he viewed with apprehension the observations recently made in the senate by the senator from Maryland, (Mr. Gorman). Mr. Rixey said it was difficult to understand why the observations of the senator from Maryland, who, the secretary said, is easily the leader of his party, should cause the secretary such serious apprehension. He said it could be accounted for only by the fact that the secretary remembers that the two political parties will meet in a few months to nominate their candidate, and that with his prophetic eye he sees that this senator will be selected and then at the general election, which follows, that this standard bearer will be successful and be transferred from the forum in which he is at present in the minority to one in which he will be in a position to shape to some extent the policy of the country.

He said he was willing to accept the statement of the senator from Maryland as giving the position of the Democratic party on the question of the navy. He said that contracts for armor plate had recently been let to the Carnegie and Bethlehem companies at \$100,000 in excess of that paid the Midvale, the only other competitor, and charged that it had been shown by the evidence of Admiral O'Neill that these two companies have agreements and are in combination. He said that money should be appropriated for the prosecution of trusts when in Pennsylvania there is a combination to control prices. Why has not the attorney-general instituted some proceeding against the Carnegie and Bethlehem companies, he asked, declaring that the government, instead of prosecuting them, is rewarding them. He said he would propose an amendment to the bill limiting the price to be paid for armor to that paid the Midvale, or \$55 a ton less than the price offered by the other two companies.

Mr. Burton of Ohio opposed the naval policy expressed in the bill and the departure from the policies which have been like the honor and bulwark of the country. He said he could not support a bill which carries so great an expenditure for a navy as the one under consideration. He asked what was the necessity of so great a navy; what nation was threatening and what nation had been attacking us, and what nation had threatened the control of the United States over the Philippines. Continuing, he asked what country held back when Panama broke away from Colombia. Turning to the Spanish war he declared there was ample opportunity for foreign powers to have formed combinations against the United States if they had so desired, but no such action had been taken. The fact is, said

Mr. Burton, that the United States does not need a large navy unless there shall be a combination of all Europe with their navies against this country. In such an event, he continued, this country could not provide a sufficient naval force without a change that would be absolutely appalling; a change in the social conditions of the country.

"We could not build a navy like that of Great Britain without changing the whole framework of our society," he said.

"What is the reason for the great expenditure of \$98,000,000?" asked Mr. Burton and answered by declaring that it meant that this country is going to attack us, and that this country is going to enter a field opposite to that occupied in the past and seek to control the politics of the world.

He said the Monroe doctrine is in no danger, and that the supremacy of this country in the western hemisphere is secure. The Monroe doctrine, he said, means that republics must prevail on this side of the earth, and that the stronger are to protect the weak. He wanted to know what intelligible disturbance the dream of the gentleman who feared Germany would attack the United States.

"The nature of the earth respect us," he said, "they honor us and so far as fear is salutary they fear us."

The tendency now was toward peace, continued Mr. Burton, and he appealed for employment of diplomacy instead of guns in the promotion of peace. He questioned the minority as to why they had not opposed these expenditures. He scouted the idea that preparation for war insures peace and in conclusion said: "I am not going to vote for a bill which declares that the United States, which should be the leader in all works of peace, is going to double, treble and quadruple its naval armaments, all under the impression that it is in the interest of peace. You are not going to make the world believe this in the interest of peace."

Mr. Powers of Massachusetts, replying briefly to Mr. Burton, made an urgent appeal for the bill, declaring that the expenditures being made are in the interest of peace. He referred to the river and harbor bills brought in by Mr. Burton, carrying large appropriations.

The reading of the bill for amendment then began.

Mr. W. W. Keenan of North Carolina endeavored to have eliminated from the bill the provision for the purchase of land for a coaling station at Guantanamo, raising a point of order against it.

Speaking generally on the subject of the navy, Mr. Keenan said he did not believe in a standstill policy, nor did he believe in getting stampeded and running wild. Guantanamo ultimately will cost \$12,000,000.

The chair overruled the point of order, and on appeal the decision was sustained by a vote of 87 to 51.

Mr. Williams said Mr. Burton had placed the minority in an unfair attitude by asking them why, in view of their declaration for peace in the Kansas City platform, they did not oppose these expenditures. He said to do this means that vessels now building would rust in their docks and sailors would go unfed. Reviewing the appropriations for the army and navy and fortifications, Mr. Williams said that such large sums were being expended for war purposes that the river and harbor committee, of which Mr. Burton is chairman, could not bring in a bill, and that government buildings could not be constructed.

Mr. Burton said his remarks were not to be construed to mean that work should be brought to a standstill on ships under construction, or that the navy should not be maintained, but that he did mean that there should be a great modification of the bill. He again questioned the Democrats as to their opposition to these expenditures and what they mean by their declaration in the Kansas City platform and why they should stop with one single minority report against a naval bill. No river and harbor bill was being reported, he said, because there was now \$38,000,000 lying in the treasury to be expended in river and harbor work, to which \$8,000,000 was to be added by the sundry civil bill, twice as much as had ever been expended in any one year.

In view of this, he said it would be futile to bring in a river and harbor bill.

Mr. Grosvenor added to this that the sundry civil bill is to carry \$145,933 for public buildings, saying that he was greatly affected to hear Mr. Williams, to whom he referred as a leader of Democrats in the house and a prospective leader in national politics, complaining because the majority was going to make further appropriations.

The house at 5:08 p. m., adjourned until tomorrow morning with the naval bill still pending.

Policemen Guard Poolrooms.
St. Louis, Feb. 22.—Notwithstanding the service of nine warrants on policemen and poolroom attendants in a recent case at Madison Friday the poolroom opened this afternoon at the usual hour with Policemen McCambridge and Street on guard.

The attendance was larger than on Saturday, many who stayed away seemingly having regained courage. Everything was quiet and the betting was brisk.

Warrants were served today by Sheriff Crover of Alton on Chief of Police McCambridge, Policemen John Meehan and William Street, and William Coyle, son of Mayor Pat Coyle. Six of the warrants were against Meehan, who is charged with false imprisonment in five warrants and with liberating a prisoner in the sixth. Street and McCambridge are charged with resisting an officer, and Coyle with attempting murder.

CANAL COMMISSION.
President Tenders Position to Two Engineers Who May Not Accept.

Washington, Feb. 22.—President Cassatt of the Pennsylvania railroad had a conference today with the president regarding the acceptance by Alfred Noble, the distinguished engineer long connected with the Pennsylvania system, of an appointment on the Panama canal commission, which has been offered him by the president. Mr. Noble has direct supervision of many of the great engineering projects of the Pennsylvania railroad, including the tunnel under the North river at New York. Quite naturally the Pennsylvania officials do not care to relinquish the services of Mr. Noble, he has talked with the president, Mr. Cassatt indicated that

Ayer's Cherry Pectoral

Sixty years of experience make us believe that this is the best medicine in the world for colds, coughs, croup, bronchitis, and all other throat and lung troubles. The best doctors believe this, too; and so will you believe it after you have once given it a trial.

25c., 50c., \$1.00. All druggists. J. C. Ayer & Co., Lowell, Mass.

Mr. Burton, that the United States does not need a large navy unless there shall be a combination of all Europe with their navies against this country. In such an event, he continued, this country could not provide a sufficient naval force without a change that would be absolutely appalling; a change in the social conditions of the country.

"We could not build a navy like that of Great Britain without changing the whole framework of our society," he said.

"What is the reason for the great expenditure of \$98,000,000?" asked Mr. Burton and answered by declaring that it meant that this country is going to attack us, and that this country is going to enter a field opposite to that occupied in the past and seek to control the politics of the world.

He said the Monroe doctrine is in no danger, and that the supremacy of this country in the western hemisphere is secure. The Monroe doctrine, he said, means that republics must prevail on this side of the earth, and that the stronger are to protect the weak. He wanted to know what intelligible disturbance the dream of the gentleman who feared Germany would attack the United States.

"The nature of the earth respect us," he said, "they honor us and so far as fear is salutary they fear us."

The tendency now was toward peace, continued Mr. Burton, and he appealed for employment of diplomacy instead of guns in the promotion of peace. He questioned the minority as to why they had not opposed these expenditures. He scouted the idea that preparation for war insures peace and in conclusion said: "I am not going to vote for a bill which declares that the United States, which should be the leader in all works of peace, is going to double, treble and quadruple its naval armaments, all under the impression that it is in the interest of peace. You are not going to make the world believe this in the interest of peace."

Mr. Powers of Massachusetts, replying briefly to Mr. Burton, made an urgent appeal for the bill, declaring that the expenditures being made are in the interest of peace. He referred to the river and harbor bills brought in by Mr. Burton, carrying large appropriations.

The reading of the bill for amendment then began.

Mr. W. W. Keenan of North Carolina endeavored to have eliminated from the bill the provision for the purchase of land for a coaling station at Guantanamo, raising a point of order against it.

Speaking generally on the subject of the navy, Mr. Keenan said he did not believe in a standstill policy, nor did he believe in getting stampeded and running wild. Guantanamo ultimately will cost \$12,000,000.

The chair overruled the point of order, and on appeal the decision was sustained by a vote of 87 to 51.

Mr. Williams said Mr. Burton had placed the minority in an unfair attitude by asking them why, in view of their declaration for peace in the Kansas City platform, they did not oppose these expenditures. He said to do this means that vessels now building would rust in their docks and sailors would go unfed. Reviewing the appropriations for the army and navy and fortifications, Mr. Williams said that such large sums were being expended for war purposes that the river and harbor committee, of which Mr. Burton is chairman, could not bring in a bill, and that government buildings could not be constructed.

Mr. Burton said his remarks were not to be construed to mean that work should be brought to a standstill on ships under construction, or that the navy should not be maintained, but that he did mean that there should be a great modification of the bill. He again questioned the Democrats as to their opposition to these expenditures and what they mean by their declaration in the Kansas City platform and why they should stop with one single minority report against a naval bill. No river and harbor bill was being reported, he said, because there was now \$38,000,000 lying in the treasury to be expended in river and harbor work, to which \$8,000,000 was to be added by the sundry civil bill, twice as much as had ever been expended in any one year.

In view of this, he said it would be futile to bring in a river and harbor bill.

Mr. Grosvenor added to this that the sundry civil bill is to carry \$145,933 for public buildings, saying that he was greatly affected to hear Mr. Williams, to whom he referred as a leader of Democrats in the house and a prospective leader in national politics, complaining because the majority was going to make further appropriations.

The house at 5:08 p. m., adjourned until tomorrow morning with the naval bill still pending.

Policemen Guard Poolrooms.
St. Louis, Feb. 22.—Notwithstanding the service of nine warrants on policemen and poolroom attendants in a recent case at Madison Friday the poolroom opened this afternoon at the usual hour with Policemen McCambridge and Street on guard.

The attendance was larger than on Saturday, many who stayed away seemingly having regained courage. Everything was quiet and the betting was brisk.

Warrants were served today by Sheriff Crover of Alton on Chief of Police McCambridge, Policemen John Meehan and William Street, and William Coyle, son of Mayor Pat Coyle. Six of the warrants were against Meehan, who is charged with false imprisonment in five warrants and with liberating a prisoner in the sixth. Street and McCambridge are charged with resisting an officer, and Coyle with attempting murder.

CANAL COMMISSION.
President Tenders Position to Two Engineers Who May Not Accept.

Washington, Feb. 22.—President Cassatt of the Pennsylvania railroad had a conference today with the president regarding the acceptance by Alfred Noble, the distinguished engineer long connected with the Pennsylvania system, of an appointment on the Panama canal commission, which has been offered him by the president. Mr. Noble has direct supervision of many of the great engineering projects of the Pennsylvania railroad, including the tunnel under the North river at New York. Quite naturally the Pennsylvania officials do not care to relinquish the services of Mr. Noble, he has talked with the president, Mr. Cassatt indicated that

feeling to him, although he does not wish to stand in the way of the government's securing Mr. Noble's services.

Thus far Mr. Noble has not indicated whether he will accept the president's tender or not, but a definite answer is expected in a day or two.

President Roosevelt has tendered an appointment on the canal commission to John Garber, a well known mining lawyer of San Francisco. Some time ago Garber had been brought out by the president by Senator Perkins and other members of the state's congressional delegation to secure the appointment of Garber, formerly a state senator of California, on the canal commission. Indeed, he was endorsed by the California legislature for the position. After careful consideration, the president concluded to tender the appointment to Garber. He notified Senators Perkins and Bard of his decision last Saturday. Both senators were at the White House today, presumably again to talk to the president about the matter, but they declined to discuss it for publication.

Mr. Garber's answer to the president's proffer has not been received.

VENEZUELAN DECISION.
State Department Greatly Regrets The Precedent Set.

Washington, Feb. 22.—A prominent official of the state department when shown the dispatch relative to the decision in the Venezuelan arbitration, stated while the department regretted exceedingly the precedent which the Hague tribunal had made in the case, there was nothing for the United States to do but accept the result philosophically as binding international law. The mere question of time when the United States shall receive from Venezuela the amount of the awards in our favor was the smallest consideration. What the government disliked was to admit the principle that a mere show of naval force by a creditor nation can secure precedence in the payment of debt over another nation that does not exercise such force. It is regarded as a premium on violence and as tending to discourage nations that are disposed to settle their claims by the peaceful methods of diplomacy.

Herrick Supreme in Ohio.
Columbus, O., Feb. 22.—Now that it is claimed by the Hanna Republicans of Ohio that Gov. Herrick has succeeded Senator Hanna as the dominant power in Ohio Republican politics, an interesting question is raised.

Speaking generally on the subject of the navy, Mr. Keenan said he did not believe in a standstill policy, nor did he believe in getting stampeded and running wild. Guantanamo ultimately will cost \$12,000,000.

The chair overruled the point of order, and on appeal the decision was sustained by a vote of 87 to 51.

Mr. Williams said Mr. Burton had placed the minority in an unfair attitude by asking them why, in view of their declaration for peace in the Kansas City platform, they did not oppose these expenditures. He said to do this means that vessels now building would rust in their docks and sailors would go unfed. Reviewing the appropriations for the army and navy and fortifications, Mr. Williams said that such large sums were being expended for war purposes that the river and harbor committee, of which Mr. Burton is chairman, could not bring in a bill, and that government buildings could not be constructed.

Mr. Burton said his remarks were not to be construed to mean that work should be brought to a standstill on ships under construction, or that the navy should not be maintained, but that he did mean that there should be a great modification of the bill. He again questioned the Democrats as to their opposition to these expenditures and what they mean by their declaration in the Kansas City platform and why they should stop with one single minority report against a naval bill. No river and harbor bill was being reported, he said, because there was now \$38,000,000 lying in the treasury to be expended in river and harbor work, to which \$8,000,000 was to be added by the sundry civil bill, twice as much as had ever been expended in any one year.

In view of this, he said it would be futile to bring in a river and harbor bill.

Mr. Grosvenor added to this that the sundry civil bill is to carry \$145,933 for public buildings, saying that he was greatly affected to hear Mr. Williams, to whom he referred as a leader of Democrats in the house and a prospective leader in national politics, complaining because the majority was going to make further appropriations.

The house at 5:08 p. m., adjourned until tomorrow morning with the naval bill still pending.

Policemen Guard Poolrooms.
St. Louis, Feb. 22.—Notwithstanding the service of nine warrants on policemen and poolroom attendants in a recent case at Madison Friday the poolroom opened this afternoon at the usual hour with Policemen McCambridge and Street on guard.

The attendance was larger than on Saturday, many who stayed away seemingly having regained courage. Everything was quiet and the betting was brisk.

Warrants were served today by Sheriff Crover of Alton on Chief of Police McCambridge, Policemen John Meehan and William Street, and William Coyle, son of Mayor Pat Coyle. Six of the warrants were against Meehan, who is charged with false imprisonment in five warrants and with liberating a prisoner in the sixth. Street and McCambridge are charged with resisting an officer, and Coyle with attempting murder.

CANAL COMMISSION.
President Tenders Position to Two Engineers Who May Not Accept.

Washington, Feb. 22.—President Cassatt of the Pennsylvania railroad had a conference today with the president regarding the acceptance by Alfred Noble, the distinguished engineer long connected with the Pennsylvania system, of an appointment on the Panama canal commission, which has been offered him by the president. Mr. Noble has direct supervision of many of the great engineering projects of the Pennsylvania railroad, including the tunnel under the North river at New York. Quite naturally the Pennsylvania officials do not care to relinquish the services of Mr. Noble, he has talked with the president, Mr. Cassatt indicated that

feeling to him, although he does not wish to stand in the way of the government's securing Mr. Noble's services.

Thus far Mr. Noble has not indicated whether he will accept the president's tender or not, but a definite answer is expected in a day or two.

President Roosevelt has tendered an appointment on the canal commission to John Garber, a well known mining lawyer of San Francisco. Some time ago Garber had been brought out by the president by Senator Perkins and other members of the state's congressional delegation to secure the appointment of Garber, formerly a state senator of California, on the canal commission. Indeed, he was endorsed by the California legislature for the position. After careful consideration, the president concluded to tender the appointment to Garber. He notified Senators Perkins and Bard of his decision last Saturday. Both senators were at the White House today, presumably again to talk to the president about the matter, but they declined to discuss it for publication.

Mr. Garber's answer to the president's proffer has not been received.

VENEZUELAN DECISION.
State Department Greatly Regrets The Precedent Set.

Washington, Feb. 22.—A prominent official of the state department when shown the dispatch relative to the decision in the Venezuelan arbitration, stated while the department regretted exceedingly the precedent which the Hague tribunal had made in the case, there was nothing for the United States to do but accept the result philosophically as binding international law. The mere question of time when the United States shall receive from Venezuela the amount of the awards in our favor was the smallest consideration. What the government disliked was to admit the principle that a mere show of naval force by a creditor nation can secure precedence in the payment of debt over another nation that does not exercise such force. It is regarded as a premium on violence and as tending to discourage nations that are disposed to settle their claims by the peaceful methods of diplomacy.

Herrick Supreme in Ohio.
Columbus, O., Feb. 22.—Now that it is claimed by the Hanna Republicans of Ohio that Gov. Herrick has succeeded Senator Hanna as the dominant power in Ohio Republican politics, an interesting question is raised.

Speaking generally on the subject of the navy, Mr. Keenan said he did not believe in a standstill policy, nor did he believe in getting stampeded and running wild. Guantanamo ultimately will cost \$12,000,000.

The chair overruled the point of order, and on appeal the decision was sustained by a vote of 87 to 51.

Mr. Williams said Mr. Burton had placed the minority in an unfair attitude by asking them why, in view of their declaration for peace in the Kansas City platform, they did not oppose these expenditures. He said to do this means that vessels now building would rust in their docks and sailors would go unfed. Reviewing the appropriations for the army and navy and fortifications, Mr. Williams said that such large sums were being expended for war purposes that the river and harbor committee, of which Mr. Burton is chairman, could not bring in a bill, and that government buildings could not be constructed.

Mr. Burton said his remarks were not to be construed to mean that work should be brought to a standstill on ships under construction, or that the navy should not be maintained, but that he did mean that there should be a great modification of the bill. He again questioned the Democrats as to their opposition to these expenditures and what they mean by their declaration in the Kansas City platform and why they should stop with one single minority report against a naval bill. No river and harbor bill was being reported, he said, because there was now \$38,000,000 lying in the treasury to be expended in river and harbor work, to which \$8,000,000 was to be added by the sundry civil bill, twice as much as had ever been expended in any one year.

In view of this, he said it would be futile to bring in a river and harbor bill.

Mr. Grosvenor added to this that the sundry civil bill is to carry \$145,933 for public buildings, saying that he was greatly affected to hear Mr. Williams, to whom he referred as a leader of Democrats in the house and a prospective leader in national politics, complaining because the majority was going to make further appropriations.

The house at 5:08 p. m., adjourned until tomorrow morning with the naval bill still pending.

HOAR AND FORAKER HAVE A LITTLE TILT

Former Charges Latter With Perverting What He Said Because His Mind Was Heated.

DEBATING PANAMA QUESTION.

The Ohio Man Nettled the Massachusetts Senator to an Uncomfortable Degree.

Washington, Feb. 22.—While the senate did not desert from its labors the day was not allowed to pass without observation. In his opening prayer, Chaplain Hale referred to the example set by Washington and his compatriots.

Prayer was followed by the reading of Washington's farewell address by Mr. Heyburn. The galleries were filled with visitors.

MR. HOAR'S SPEECH.
The Bacon resolution on the Panama canal question was then taken up and Mr. Hoar addressed the senate.

"It seems," he said, "that the dream of centuries is about to be realized. For more than four centuries the commerce of the world has been chafing against the rock constituting the isthmus of Darien, and all this time there has been a general desire to penetrate the barrier."

For himself he would have been glad if there could have been a more careful inspection of the Panama route, but in the absence of that he was willing to submit to the judgment of others—was ready to join in the enthusiasm with which the people of the United States are about to enter upon the great enterprise.

Mr. Hoar then turned his attention to the canal treaty, announcing his intention to vote for it.

His former speech, he said, had been construed with a resolution asking for information such as was usually freely given. He had been surprised at the efforts to delay and hinder that resolution, but that he had no feeling against the president, was abundantly shown by other expressions on his part, favorable to Mr. Roosevelt, some of which he quoted.

He considered that he was doing the president a real favor in asking for the information, because of the criticisms of the unfriendly press, and he believed that all the foul and infamous charges would be fully met by supplying all the information to be had on the subject.

The charges, he said, were having an ill effect at home and abroad, as had been evidenced by letters which he received. These letters were from personal and political friends—men of high standing, and not from mugs or men without standing. He had then said that the president was guilty of the gravest error, and that he had also absolved the secretary of state as not capable of the conduct charged.

At the time, however, it seemed to him that the explanation of the circumstances regarding Panama was in a very imperfect state. Consequently, he had felt justified in pointing out the question should have been asked, and had, for instance, been no information of the fact that the administration had been informed of the threatened revolution. Indeed, the only important fact known was that the landing of Colombian troops had been forbidden. In view of the circumstances, Mr. Hoar asked, was it an act of disloyalty to the party to ask the information requested in the resolution?

His own query he said that the friend of the president who could take exception to it must be sensitive indeed. That the president and the secretary of state had agreed with him, he thought was evidenced by the fact that the testimony asked for had been given. Mr. Hoar quoted the president's declaration of complicity on the part of the United States and asked: "Is there any man, friend or foe, who will doubt that statement?" Will the campaign orators from Portland to San Francisco have among them one who will accuse that brave and honest man with honesty when he gave utterance to that statement?

Again expressing his conviction that later events had vindicated his course, Mr. Hoar expressed his confidence in the wisdom and courage of the president, saying that he had no secrets from the people, and adding: "We approve what he has done already and what he has promised to do."

Massachusetts had, he also said, supported Mr. Roosevelt through one administration and expected to support him in another.

Passing to the more immediate consideration of the treaty, Mr. Hoar said that the independence of Panama was an accomplished fact, and all that the senate has to do is to deal with the treaty on its merits.

MR. FORAKER'S REPLY.
In the course of his remarks Mr. Hoar made complaint of the speech made by Mr. Foraker in criticism of his previous address, and when Mr. Hoar concluded Mr. Foraker in reply said that if he had on the former occasion misunderstood Mr. Hoar, he was not the only senator who had done so. He quoted the speech made previously by Mr. Gorman in which Mr. Hoar had said that if he had on the former occasion misunderstood Mr. Hoar, he was not the only senator who had done so. He quoted the speech made previously by Mr. Gorman in which Mr. Hoar had said that if he had on the former occasion misunderstood Mr. Hoar, he was not the only senator who had done so.

Whether Mr. Gorman properly interpreted the speech the record must testify. Senator Foraker quoted passages from Mr. Hoar's former speech in justification of his interpretation. Mr. Foraker referred to the fact that Mr. Hoar in his first speech had quoted a number of official telegrams bearing on the situation in Panama, declaring the conclusion that the Panama revolution and then had taken the spoils.

MR. HOAR NETTLED.
Mr. Hoar evidently was nettled by this statement, and he interrupted Mr. Foraker to say that this was not his conclusion, but the conclusion of others, and that he had mentioned the fact. On the contrary, he had spoken in praise of the president.

Mr. Foraker said the Massachusetts senator had spoken in terms of praise of the president, but of what avail is all that when coupled with the senator's interpretation of the telegram, and that in the face of what the president had said about having no complicity in the Panama uprising.

Mr. Hoar said he had no doubt of Mr. Foraker's sincerity, but, he said, "I can not reconcile his expression of respect for me with his expression of his belief of what I say as to my position."

Mr. Foraker said he was merely following Mr. Hoar's example who had both praised and criticized the president in his former speech.

"The senator totally perverts what I said," replied Mr. Hoar. "He did so on the previous occasion and he does so now, and he does not from any desire to do so, but solely because of his

being in a very zealous and heated frame of mind."

"To whom," asked Mr. Foraker, "did the senator refer as a policeman?" alluding to a former speech made by Mr. Hoar in which he compared the United States in the Panama affair to a big policeman who manacled a small man and then seized the spoils.

Mr. Hoar replied that he did not mean the president and he insisted that Mr. Foraker had undertaken to interpret his meaning by separating a statement of his speech from the context.

The two senators stood within two or three feet of each other, and talked back and forth directly. They gestulated earnestly and spoke with great emphasis, frequently punctuating their remarks with expressions of mutual regard. Each asserted more than once that the other was mistaken and as frequently the statement was made that each had been misunderstood. The situation was quite intense and continued for several minutes, until the presiding officer called attention to the violation of the rules of debate. The immediate point of dispute was the question whether at the time of Mr. Hoar's former speech denial had been made of the president's complicity in the Panama affair, Mr. Hoar contending that no such denial had been made. When Mr. Foraker said it had been, the Massachusetts senator replied in so many words: "That I deny."

Mr. Hoar charged Mr. Foraker had done him an injustice, but the latter replied that such was not the case. On the contrary, the justice had been done to him (Foraker). Every senator knew the president denied the complicity charge through the press, said Mr. Foraker, and in view of that denial he had absolute faith in the president and his administration. His complaint was that Mr. Hoar had put the president in a false light.

Mr. Hoar replied that the president should make his communications to the Congress and not to the press, and Mr. Foraker replied that that, too, had been done.

CARMACK'S SPEECH.
When the controversy between Messrs. Hoar and Foraker had been concluded, Mr. Carmack took the floor. He said he had no desire to participate in "the laundry work going on on the other side," but that he wanted to speak on another branch of the canal question. His remarks constituted a severe arraignment of Minister Bunau-Varilla, and included a review of his connection with the Panama canal, based on official French documents which were quoted. His accusation was that Bunau-Varilla had been associated with Baron de Reinach in his dealings with the stockholders of the old canal company. He charged that the present minister had taken advantage of the situation to wreck the enterprise for the purpose of enriching himself, and he added that the irony of fate was illustrated in the circumstances that while de Reinach had committed suicide Bunau-Varilla had been sent as a minister to the United States.

Mr. Carmack declared that the Panama canal company had no right to the canal right of way.

CULLOM'S ADDRESS.
Mr. Cullom followed with a carefully prepared address in support of the treaty, reviewing the circumstances leading to the negotiation of the agreement. Speaking of Colombia's attitude toward the Hay-Herran treaty, he said it had been a great blunder. He hoped Colombia would come to appreciate this fact and accept the situation. He quoted official papers to show that neither the United States nor Colombia could have been surprised at the accession of Panama and argued that, the American administration being thus warned, could not have done